BEFORE THE APPEALS BOARD FOR THE KANSAS DIVISION OF WORKERS COMPENSATION

BRAULIO MUNOZ)
Claimant)
VS.)
) Docket No. 1,010,583
BECERRA CONSTRUCTION, INC.)
Respondent	j
AND)
)
AMERICAN FAMILY INSURANCE)
Insurance Carrier)

ORDER

Claimant appealed the November 6, 2003 preliminary hearing Order entered by Administrative Law Judge Kenneth J. Hursh.

ISSUES

This is a claim for an April 17, 2003 accident. In the November 6, 2003 Order, Judge Hursh affirmed an earlier preliminary hearing finding that claimant's average weekly wage was \$40.

Claimant initiated this appeal contending the Judge erred in determining the average weekly wage. That is the only issue on this appeal.

Respondent and its insurance carrier argue this appeal should be dismissed as a finding of average weekly wage is not an issue that may be reviewed from a preliminary hearing order.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After considering the parties' arguments, the Board finds and concludes that claimant's appeal should be dismissed.

This is an appeal from a preliminary hearing order. Consequently, the Board's jurisdiction to review preliminary hearing findings is limited. At this stage of the claim, not every alleged error is subject to review. The Board can review preliminary hearing orders

BRAULIO MUNOZ

in which an administrative law judge exceeded his or her jurisdiction. K.S.A. 2002 Supp. 44-551. Additionally, the Board has specific authority to review the preliminary hearing issues listed in K.S.A. 44-534a, which are:

- (1) did the worker sustain an accidental injury,
- (2) did the injury arise out of and in the course of employment,
- (3) did the worker provide timely notice and timely written claim, and
- (4) do certain other defenses apply.

And the term "certain defenses" refers to defenses that dispute the compensability of the injury under the Workers Compensation Act.¹

The issue of the amount of a worker's average weekly wage is not a jurisdictional issue that is listed in K.S.A. 44-534a. Moreover, the Judge did not exceed his jurisdiction in deciding it. Consequently, this appeal should be dismissed.

WHEREFORE, the Board dismisses claimant's appeal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this ____ day of December 2003.

BOARD MEMBER

c: David J. Grummon, Attorney for Claimant
Patricia A. Wohlford, Attorney for Respondent and its Insurance Carrier
Kenneth J. Hursh, Administrative Law Judge
Anne Haught, Acting Workers Compensation Director

¹ Carpenter v. National Filter Service, 26 Kan. App. 2d 672, 994 P.2d 641 (1999).